

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

Resource Management and Climate Protection Task Force Minutes from the 9-9-11 Meeting

Next meeting: October 14, 2011, 1-3pm - 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City

In attendance:

Noelle Bell, Ecology Action
Maryann Moise Derwin, Committee Vice Chair, Portola Valley Town Council*
Pedro Gonzalez, South San Francisco City Council*
Deborah Gordon, Committee Chair, Woodside Town Council*
Jorge Jaramillo, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Kathy Lavezzo, PG&E
Richard Napier, C/CAG
Barbara Pierce, Redwood City Council*
Dave Pine, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors*
Sepi Richardson, Brisbane City Council*
Eric Sevim, A+ Japanese Auto Repair
Kim Springer, San Mateo County RecycleWorks (staff)
Lauren Swezey, Facebook
Susan Wright, San Mateo County RecycleWorks (staff)

Not in attendance:

Bob Cormia, Foothill De Anza Community College
Nicole Sandkulla, BAWSCA
Staff, Sustainable San Mateo County
*=Voting member

1) Introductions: Each attendee introduced themselves and their organization.

2) Public Comment: There were no public comments.

3) Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the August 18, 2011 meeting were approved.

4) Presentation on New Energy Data Tool from PG&E (Kim Springer, Ryan Mack):

Kim explained that community energy information is now available from PG&E that can help with climate action planning, targeting of marketing campaigns such as Energy Upgrade, and writing the County's Energy Strategy document.

Ryan explained that privacy rules have been clarified, and that now the following reports are available without a non-disclosure agreement:

RMCP Meeting Minutes
September 9, 2010 - 2

- Community-wide aggregated greenhouse gas inventories
- Municipal aggregated greenhouse gas inventory data
- Aggregated community overview
- Non-residential overview
- Municipal operations
- Residential overview

With a non-disclosure agreement, monthly community energy use and data to support targeting of residential energy efficiency opportunities is available.

He shared the basic information about overall county energy use from 2005 to 2010:

Residential energy use is 46% (29% of that is electricity, 71% is natural gas)

Non-residential energy use is 54% (47% of that is electricity, 53% is natural gas)

Overall countywide energy usage from 2005 to 2010 is up by 3.3%, however the rate of acceleration has slowed.

Non-residential electricity use is down 0.3%, while natural gas is up 8%.

Residential electricity use is up 2.2%, and natural gas is up 2.5%.

The non-residential sectors that use about 80% of energy (collectively) are (in order of use from highest to lowest):

- Manufacturing & transportation
- Offices
- Hospitality
- Retail
- High tech
- Healthcare
- Biotech

Schools fall just below.

From 2005 to 2010, the residential sector accounted for

- 34.9% of total electricity usage
- 44.8 of total CO2 emissions
- 53.5% of total natural gas usage

Single family dwellings accounted for 97.3% of this use, versus 2.7% used by multi-family dwellings.

45% of CO2 emissions were produced by the residential sector, 55% by non-residential.

5) Presentation on the County Green Business Program (Kim Springer, Joe La Mariana):

Joe La Mariana, Waste Management and Environmental Service Section Manager, explained that San Mateo County's Green Business Program was modeled after the ABAG Bay Area Green Business Program. Currently, the following cities participate in the program: Belmont, Burlingame, Daly City, Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, Pacifica, Redwood City, San Carlos, South San Francisco, and the County of San Mateo. The San Francisco International Airport, the South Bayside Waste Management Authority (SBWMA), County Environmental Health, and various Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) agencies also participate.

RMCP Meeting Minutes
September 9, 2010 - 3

The program has certified 142 small- to medium-size businesses to date; 90 more are in queue. The four areas evaluated are energy, water, solid waste, and pollution prevention.

Joe explained that until January 1, 2011, the program had a solid financial model: funds from the Ox Mountain contract went to environmental initiatives. But now AB939 mandates that funds from Ox Mountain can only be used for recycling and waste diversion. Because only 25% of the program is eligible for AB939 fees (the recycling/solid waste portion), a long-term funding source needs to be secured by the end of December or the program will be terminated.

The total estimated annual budget is \$160,000. The county has found funding to cover half of the program. The committee discussed several possibilities for the remainder:

- San Francisco International Airport might be able to fund \$15,000 - \$20,000.
- BAWSCA is interested, but they would need to pay on a per-business basis as opposed to pay a reliable, flat annual fee.
- Businesses could be asked to pay an application fee of \$100 or more depending on the size of the business. Need to make it clear that the fee isn't to pay for the audits however, because those are free. Fee is going to offset administrative costs.
- C/CAG may ask cities to support the program.

The committee made several suggestions:

- Make sure that potential funders and participants in the program are aware of the savings that result when green upgrades (especially energy, water, and waste reduction) are made. Could benchmark four or five items to show the savings.
- Get the Chambers of Commerce to be partners in promoting the program, even if they can't support it financially. If businesses are asked to pay an application fee, Chambers could offer a discount on that amount for Chamber members.
- Make sure that cities realize that supporting the program is part of C/CAG's recommended measures for climate action plans.
- Perhaps someone could do it part time instead of full time? The program wouldn't be able to handle as many businesses. The goal is 100 annually. There are 10,000 businesses in SBWMA service area. Plus businesses need to be recertified every three years. For the first recertification, it's the same audit as the original one. In future years, it's a self-audit.
- People don't know where green businesses are, or what that means. The Chamber thinks it costs money to be green, even the opposite tends to be true. KCBS has an audio cue – this advertiser is a green business. The county should acknowledge and recognize green businesses. Every green business could display a poster listing the names of other green businesses in that city.

6) Review of the First Two Sections of the San Mateo County Energy Strategy 2015 (Kim Springer):

Kim explained that the first two sections were written based on the outline discussed in the last two meetings. The goal is to have the original document stand alone; the update will be a short addendum.

Comments:

- List accomplishments since the original energy strategy was drafted.
- Explain that all of this was accomplished through grant funding. (Put this second.)

RMCP Meeting Minutes
September 9, 2010 - 4

- In “Awareness Change” section, give the public more credit. Make the tone more positive. Use the word “embraced,” because there has been a real shift in understanding.
- In “Resource Conservation” section, AB32 and SB375 need to be explained. The general public doesn’t know these bills.
- Equate the savings with something real.
- Move bullets of efforts completed and move funding sources info to the end, under efforts completed.

7) Set Next Meeting Dates:

October 14 1-3pm

no November meeting

December 9 1-3pm

8) Committee Updates

CAP Template and Tool Project: Richard Napier and Kim Springer gave an update about their meeting with representatives from the State Attorney General, the Office of Planning and Research, and the Air District to discuss how to handle the issue of CEQA for the CAP template project. There was very positive reaction to the concept. The State is thrilled to have 21 plans all done in the same manner.

The group clarified that the CAP template document doesn’t need an EIR because it is a planning document, but a city’s actual CAP does. When C/CAG does its CAP (primarily regional transportation issues), it will probably do an EIR. If cities do a General Plan update along with their CAP, it may be suggested that they do an EIR. If they don’t do a General Plan update, it may be suggested that they do an initial study and negative declaration. Ultimately, C/CAG will provide templates for both of those documents.